#### Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 1 Filed 04/13/12 Page 1 of 5

Greg Addington, Assistant U.S. Attorney Susan L. Schneider, Trial Attorney U.S. Department of Justice Environment and Natural Resources Div. 999 – 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 370 Denver, Colorado 80202 (303) 844-1348 susan.schneider@usdoj.gov Attorneys for the United States of America

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) IN EQUITY NO. C-125-ECR
	) Subproceedings: C-125-B & C-125-C
Plaintiff,	) 3:73-CV-00125-ECR-WGC
	) 3:73-CV-00127-ECR-WGC &
WALKER RIVER PAIUTE TRIBE,	) 3:73-CV-00128-ECR-WGC
DI ' CCC I A	)
Plaintiff-Intervenor,	)
VS.	) CHIDMICCION OF ALTERNATIVE
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, a corporation, et al.,	<ul> <li>SUBMISSION OF ALTERNATIVE</li> <li>PROPOSED ORDERS REGARDING</li> <li>CERTAIN ISSUES ADDRESSED AT THE</li> </ul>
Defendants.	STATUS CONFERENCE OF MARCH 13,
MINERAL COUNTY,	)
Proposed-Plaintiff-Intervenor,	)
vs.	)
WALKER RIVER IRRIGATION DISTRICT, a corporation, et al.	) ) )
Proposed Defendants.	, ) )

The United States of America ("United States"), Plaintiff in Case No. C-125 and Subproceeding C-125-B, hereby submits two versions of a proposed *Order Regarding Certain Issues Addressed at the Status Conference of March 13*, 2012, which this Court directed the United States to prepare and review with the primary parties, before submitting it to the Court for review. The proposed Order addresses the following issues:

1. the requests for removal from the mailing list in C-125-B filed by Mary Rosachi (Doc. #B-1691) and Walker General Inc. (Doc. #B-1692);

#### Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 1 Filed 04/13/12 Page 2 of 5

- 2. the application of the Order Regarding Service by the Clerk's Office (Doc. #B-1300, Feb. 1, 2008) to all attorneys in subproceeding C-125-B;
- 3. the Court's inquiry whether there were any objections to the Proof of Service (Number Five), C-125-B (Doc. #-B-1670, Nov. 30, 2011); and
- 4. filings by and service on the United States Board of Water Commissioners ("Board").

The only language in the proposed Order for which the parties did not reach agreement concerns Issue #4 and whether the Order should state that the Board has "standing" to file. The transcript of the Status Conference on March 13, 2012, includes the following comment by the Court:

That is going to be the order of the Court going forward. The U.S. Board of Water Commissioners has – I'm going to call it standing to serve documents in these actions. . .

Transcript of Status Conference, March 13, 2012 at 24, lines 20-23. It is unclear whether the Court intended this statement to be a legal finding. During the parties' initial status conference with the Court on February 6, 2012, the Court indicated that it wanted any issues regarding the scope of the Board's authority to be raised in a motion and briefed before it would address them. Thus, it would appear that the Court did not intend to issue a legal finding regarding standing without a legal or factual analysis or a briefing of the issue by the parties. Furthermore, the Court stated at the March 13, 2012, status conference that it was not addressing any issue that the Tribe indicated it was in the process of raising with the Board. The scope of the Board's authority to act in these and other proceedings is among the issues that the Tribe, a member of the Board, wishes to address with the Board.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Furthermore, if the Court intends a legal finding of "standing" for the Board, this finding may conflict with the underlying Order that appointed the Board in 1937. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P 53.

Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 1 Filed 04/13/12 Page 3 of 5

The differences between the two versions of the proposed Order concern Issue #4 (at p. 3

of each version) and are shown below in capital letters:

1. <u>Version A</u> states: "[t]he Court finds that the [Board] <u>HAS STANDING TO</u> serve

and file documents in these actions . . . . "

2. <u>Version B</u> states: "[t]he Court finds that the [Board] <u>MAY</u> serve and file

documents in these actions. . . . "

The Board's attorney supports Version A. The United States, the Walker River Paiute Tribe and

Mineral County support Version B, which was initially proposed by the Walker River Irrigation

District. Counsel for the State of Nevada thinks both versions are fine, but prefers Version B.

The United States received no other comments on this issue.

The United States suggests that Version B of the proposed Order would avoid any party

having to consider appealing the Order and allow the Court and the parties to address the scope

of the Board's authority at an appropriate future time in a specific factual context and after the

issue is briefed.

Dated: April 13, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

Greg Addington, Assistant United States Attorney

Susan L. Schneider, Trial Attorney

U.S. Department of Justice

Environmental and Natural Resources Div.

999 – 18<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 370

Denver, Colorado 80202

(303) 844-1348

susan.schneider@usdoj.gov

By \_\_/s/ Susan L. Schneider

SUSAN L. SCHNEIDER

Attorneys for the United States of America

3

### Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 1 Filed 04/13/12 Page 4 of 5

#### **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 13th day of April 2012, I electronically filed the foregoing **SUBMISSION OF ALTERNATIVE PROPOSED ORDERS REGARDING CERTAIN ISSUES ADDRESSED AT THE STATUS CONFERENCE OF MARCH 13, 2012** with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to the email addresses that are registered for this case;

and I further certify that I served a copy of the forgoing to the following non CM/ECF participants by U.S. Mail, postage prepaid, this 13th day of April, 2012:

Athena Brown, Superintendent Western Nevada Agency Bureau of Indian Affairs 311 E. Washington Street Carson City, NV 89701-4065

Allen Biaggi/Leo Drozdoff
Dept. of Conservation & Natural Res.
State of Nevada
901 S. Stewart St.
Suite 1003
Carson City, NV 89701

State Engineer - Division of Water Resources State of Nevada 901 S. Stewart St., Suite 202 Carson City, NV 89701

Dist. Attorney for Lyon County 31 South Main Street Yerington, NV 89447

William J. Shaw Brooke & Shaw, Ltd P.O. Box 2860 Minden, NV 89423

## Case 3:73-cv-00128-MMD-CSD Document 1 Filed 04/13/12 Page 5 of 5

George M. Keele 1692 County Road, Ste. A Minden, NV 89423

George N. Bloise 34 Artist View Lane Smith, NV 89450

Arthur B. Walsh Los Angeles City Attorney's Office PO Box 51-111 111 North Hope Street, Suite 340 Los Angeles, CA 90054

Gayle Poulsen 3313 Cherry Lane, #325 Meridian, ID 83642

/s/ Yvonne M. Marsh Yvonne M. Marsh, Paralegal Specialist United States Department of Justice